DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 832 PS 001 737

By-McNamara, J. Regis; And Others
Evaluation of the Effects of Head Start Experience in the Area of Self-Concept, Social Skills, and Language Skills. Pre-Publication Draft.
Dade County Board of Public Instruction, Miami, Fla.
Pub Date Jul 68
Note-54p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.80
Descriptors-Child Rearing, *Compensatory Education Programs, Culturally Disadvantaged, *Language Skills, Medical Evaluation, Physical Development, Post Testing, Preschool Programs, Pretesting, *Program Evaluation, *Self Concept, *Social Adjustment, Test Reliability, Test Validity
Identifiers-Anxiety Scale, Childrens Projective Pictures of Self Concept, *Head Start, Illinois Index of Self Derogation, Preschool Attainment Record, Self Concept Rating Scale

About 180 Negro Head Start children in Dade County, Florida, were tested (1) to discover if the county's program contributed significantly to language skills, social skills, and self-concept development and (2) to determine if an efficient instrument could be developed to measure self-concept in the disadvantaged child. Pretests and posttests used were the Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept, the Preschool Attainment Record, the Self-Concept Rating Scale, and an anxiety scale. In the posttest phase, 20 subjects in a proportional random selection were compared with 20 control children (from the same districts) with no preschool experience. The Head Start sample performed significantly better on tests measuring social skills, language skills, and self-concept. The meaning of the significance was unclear because of the possibility of an interaction effect between the pretest and the experimental variable; namely, exposure to the Head Start program. It was suggested that Head Starters entering the first grade the following fall be tested and that their performance be compared with the performance of a control group with no preschool experience. (DO)

ED028832

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTS OF HEAD START EXPERIENCE IN THE AREAS OF SELF-CONCEPT, SOCIAL SKILLS, AND LANGUAGE SKILLS

Report prepared by

J. Regis McNamara and Charles L. Porterfield

and

Lawrence E. Miller and Harvey S. Arnold

Head Start Psychological Services

Dade County Board of Public Instruction

July, 1968

PS 001737

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY J. Regis McNamara, Charles L. Porterfield, Lawrence E. Miller, Harvey S. Arnold TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Pre-Publication Draft: Not for attribution or quotation without permission of the authors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

General Procedure 2

Subjects 2

Methodology. 2

Results and Discussion 4

Influence of the Head Start Program. 4

Characteristics of the Children's

Projective Pictures of Self-Concept. 9

Item Discrimination 9

Validity and Reliability of CPPSC 10

Relationship to other Pretests 11

Medical and Sociological Information

and its Relationship to Self-Concept 12

Formation in Head Start Children 12

Introduction 12

Sociological Findings 12

Medical Findings 18

Conclusion 21

Appendix A

Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept 26

Preschool Attainment Record (Rapport,

Communication, Responsibility) 30

Self-Concept Rating Scale 32

Anxiety Scale 35

Appendix B

Illinois Index of Self-Derogation 40

Appendix C

Parental Punitiveness Scale 45

Social History Inquiry Form 49

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Means, standard deviations, t ratio, and level of significance between posttest scores on total sample of Head Start Evaluation Project.	5
2.	Means, standard deviations, t ratio, and level of significance between pre and posttest scores on boys involved in the Head Start Evaluation Project.	6
3.	Means, standard deviations, t ratio, and level of significance between pre and posttest scores on girls involved in the Head Start Evaluation Project.	7
4.	Means, standard deviations, t ratios, and level of significance between pretest scores of boys and girls on Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept and Social Skills.	7
5.	Comparison of Head Start Children with no preschool children on language skills, social skills, and Self-Concept (CPPSC).	8
6.	Item discrimination values for pretest administration to boys of the Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept.	9
7.	Item discrimination values for pretest administration to girls of the Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept.	10
8.	Correlations between pretest instruments on the total population of Head Start Evaluation Project.	11
9.	Comparison of high and low self-concept children on density of living space.	12
10.	Proportion of Head Start Children punished by significant others in household.	16
11.	Comparison of ideal and actual parental expectations for future occupational status of their children by per cent of occurence.	17
12.	Differences in high and low self-concept children on the measures of height, weight, and hemoglobin status.	19
13.	Means, standard deviations for the combined group of high and low self-concept children for height, weight, and hemoglobin status.	19
14.	Correlation coefficients for CPPSC scores with height, weight, and hemoglobin status.	20

Introduction

Head Start, since its inception as a social engineering experiment, has been concerned with its effectiveness in changing the behavioral destinies of the disadvantaged child. The major thrust of this intervention effort has been directed toward enhancing the educational potential of the preschool child. This in turn has focused the attention of evaluators on limited, although not unimportant issues, e.g. intellectual growth, cognitive gains, language gains, etc. (McDavid, 1968 b). Other efforts (Karnes, 1968; Karnes, Hodgins, & Teska, 1968; Bereiter, 1967; Bereiter & Engelmann, 1966) have attempted to relate programmatic elements and teaching strategies to educational productivity in the disadvantaged child. It should be noted, however, that there has been much systematic investigation in areas outside the educational realm. A brief inspection of the Educational Resources Information Clearinghouse (ERIC) files indicates that research on intervention with the disadvantaged child is indeed broad in scope. Such areas as health, nutrition, community action, parent involvement--to name only a few have all been actively studied.

The present evaluation effort has taken into consideration the broad-based goals of Head Start's Child Development Programs (Head Start Manual, 1967, Pp. 2-3) as well as the character of the research on the disadvantaged child. Proceeding from these two pivotal points, the research attempted to answer the following questions:

1. Does Dade County's Head Start Program contribute significantly to the growth of language proficiency, social skills, and self-concept development in the disadvantaged child it serves?

2. Can an efficient and discriminating instrument be developed that will meaningfully measure self-concept development in the disadvantaged child?

3. Finally, to what extent do medical and sociological variables relate to self-concept development?

General Procedure

Subjects: One-hundred eighty Head Start children were originally selected for study. They were chosen according to representative randomized sampling. First, two schools from the North Central, South Central, and South District were chosen as characteristic of the Head Start population in the respective districts. Second, five children were randomly selected from each of six classrooms in the target schools. Some subjects were lost from the original pool of 180 subjects due to absences on testing days, withdrawals from the program, or transfers to non-target schools.

Methodology: A pretest-posttest design combined with a post-test comparison design was used to study the effects of Head Start influence in the areas of self-concept, social skills, and language skills. The children were pretested in the middle of December and posttested five months later in the middle of May (prepost part of study). In the posttest phase of the study, a proportional random

selection of 20 subjects from the North and South Central District was drawn from the original sample and compared with 20 control children without preschool experience from the two districts. Comparison between groups was made on the posttest scores of the Head Start children and the original scores of the control children, who were tested over the summer (post-test comparison part of study). The instruments used for both the pre and posttest part of the study were the Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept (CPPSC); the Rapport, Communication, and Responsibility sections of the Preschool Attainment Record (PAR); the Self-Concept Rating Scale (SCRS); and an anxiety scale. An introduction to these instruments, along with their instructions, is presented in Appendix A.

Whereas the CPPSC was administered directly to the children by an examiner, the PAR was administered via interview to either the teacher or parent by an examiner. The SCRS and the anxiety scale were rated by the teachers. The general instructions to the teachers on both rating scales involved rating all of their children on a single item, after which all the children were rated on the next item, and so on for the remaining items. These instructions were used to avoid the "halo effect" of rater bias. It should also be noted that the Rapport and Responsibility sections of the PAR were combined to represent the area of social skills, while the Communication section was equated with language skills.

At the end of the pretesting, extreme scores on the CPPSC (upper and lower 27%) were singled out for further examination

on the posttesting. On posttesting these children received, in addition to the regular posttest instruments, a modified version of the Illinois Index of Self-Derogation (IISD). An introduction to this instrument, along with its instructions, is given in Appendix B. Additional medical and sociological information was also obtained on the high and low groups. The medical data consisted of height, weight, and hemoglobin status obtained from the medical records. The sociological data was obtained through social worker interviews involving collection of information with a Social History Inquiry Form (SHIF) and a modified form of the Parental Punitiveness Scale (PPS). These instruments are presented in Appendix C.

Additional test-retest data for the CPPSC was obtained on 28 six-year-olds from a Day Care Center. The phases of the study involving division of subjects into extreme groups and collection of test-retest data were primarily performed to study various properties of validity and reliability for the CPPSC.

Results and Discussion

Influence of Head Start Program: In analyzing the effects of Head Start influence, comparisons of pre and posttest scores were made. As can be seen in Table 1, significant changes in the total sample resulted in the areas of projective pictures, Social Skills (PAR), and Language Skills (PAR). These changes were all in the direction of desirable gains. Changes in scores on the teacher ratings of self-concept and anxiety did not reach

significance. As one possible explanation for the nonsignificant findings, it can be stated that teacher ratings over a period of time involve shifts in frame of reference, which, as McDavid (1968 a) has observed, make questionable the interpretation of pre and posttest comparisons.

Table 1: Means, standard deviations, t-ratio, and level of significance between pre and posttest scores on total sample of Head Start Evaluation Project.

Instrument	Means		Std. Deviation		t-ratio	Significance
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test		
Self-Concept Rating Scale	20.09 N=170	20.56 N=156	6.50	6.97	.63	None
Anxiety Scale	42.79 N=170	41.44 N=159	9.55	9.60	1.27	None
Projective Pictures	12.12 N=167	13.91 N=158	4.47	4.74	3.49	p <.001
Social Skills (P.A.R.)	24.89 N=174	26.05 N=164	3.65	2.41	3.52	p <.001
Language Skills (P.A.R.)	8.68 N=174	10.63 N=164	2.18	1.94	8.59	p <.001

PS 001737

In order to judge whether Head Start experience had a differential effect upon boys and girls, individual comparisons were made. As seen in Table 2, changes in Boys' pre and posttests were in basic agreement with the total group findings. Table 3 reflects a similar agreement between changes of the girls' scores and those

of the total group. The data suggest that Head Start experience has no differential effect upon girls and boys at the stated acceptable levels of significance. This is confirmed in part by the nonsignificant relationship found between boys and girls on a pretest comparison (Table 4). Further analysis of sex differences in the projective pictures is made in the section that follows.

Table 2: Means, standard deviations, t-ratio, and level of significance between pre and posttest scores on boys involved in the Head Start Evaluation Project.

Instrument	Means		Std. Deviation		t-ratio	Significance
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test		
Self-Concept Rating Scale	19.66 N=87	20.30 N=83	5.78	6.53	.674	None
Anxiety Scale	43.06 N=87	41.42 N=84	7.41	8.70	1.312	None
Projective Pictures	11.69 N=86	14.36 N=84	4.16	4.51	4.05	p .001
Social Skills (P.A.R.)	24.60 N=88	25.84 N=86	3.04	2.56	2.85	p .01
Language Skills (P.A.R.)	8.65 N=88	10.63 N=86	2.05	1.93	2.08	p .05

Table 3: Means, standard deviations, t-ratio, and level of significance between pre and posttest scores on girls involved in the Head Start Evaluation Project.

Instrument	Means		Std. Deviation		t-ratio	Significance
	Pre Test	Post Test	Pre Test	Post Test		
Self-Concept Rating Scale	20.54 N=83	20.85 N=73	6.83	7.46	.21	None
Anxiety Scale	42.51 N=83	41.47 N=75	10.32	10.51	.627	None
Projective Pictures	12.58 N= 71	13.41 N= 71	4.59	4.90	2.04	$p < .05$
Social Skills (P.A.R.)	25.19 N=86	26.29 N=78	3.17	2.22	3.40	$p < .001$
Language Skills (P.A.R.)	8.72 N=86	10.64 N=78	2.11	1.94	6.00	$p < .001$

Table 4: Means, standard deviations, t-ratio, and level of significance between pretest scores of boys and girls on Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept and Social Skills.

Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-ratio	Significance
Boys	86	11.69	4.16	1.29	None
Girls	81	12.58	4.59		

Social Skills

Group	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	t-ratio	Significance
Boys	88	24.60	3.04	.40	None
Girls	86	25.19	3.17		

Table 5: Indicates that the Head Start sample performed significantly better than their no preschool counterparts on tests measuring social skills, language skills, and self-concept. It should be noted, however, that the meaning of the significance is somewhat unclear. This is because of the possibility of an interaction effect between the pretest and the experimental variable, viz. exposure to the Head Start Program. It would be advisable, therefore, to test Head Start children entering first grade in the fall who were not included in the present evaluation effort and compare their performance against a new control group of no preschoolers to clarify the relationship found.

Comparison of Head Start children with no preschool children on language skills, social skills, and self-concept (CPPSC)

		Social Skills	Language Skills	Self-Concept
Head Start (N=20)	X	26.58	11.03	15.85
	S.D.	1.70	2.30	2.99
Head Start (N=20)	X	24.60	9.33	12.30
	S.D.	2.97	1.91	3.50
	t	2.6*	2.5*	3.4**

* .05.
** .01.

Characteristics of the CPPSC:

Item discrimination:

In order to ascertain sex differences on the CPPSC, efforts were made to discriminate items within the test. The method of item discrimination differentiates individual item responses of high and low scoring groups. For this purpose a Chi-Square analysis was made for each of the items on the CPPSC protocols of High and Low Self-Concept groups, with Yates correction applied where necessary. Tables 6 and 7 present the results of the item discrimination analysis. As shown in Table 6 all but three of the pictures (3, 6, 7) discriminated boys of the High and Low Self-Concept groups. The girls, as shown in Table 7, did not show as great a level of discrimination across all items as did the boys, items 2, 5, 7, and 8 failing to meet the criteria for discrimination. In all, the boys' items appeared to be more effective in separating High and Low Self-Concept groups than did the girls'.

Table 6: CPPSC item discrimination values for boys of High and Low Self-Concept groups (N=39)

Item Number	Chi Square Value	Significance
1	17.55	$p < .01$
2	22.02	$p < .01$
3	1.67	None
4	12.76	$p < .01$
5	27.53	$p < .01$
6	3.29	None
7	3.65	None
8	11.89	$p < .05$
9	20.00	$p < .01$
10	15.26	$p < .01$

Table 7: CPPSC item discrimination values for girls of High and Low Self-Concept groups (N=35)

Item Number	Chi Square Value	Significance
1	17.26	$p < .01$
2	3.56	None
3	7.18	$p < .01$
4	13.25	$p < .01$
5	5.64	None
6	4.17	$p < .05$
7	3.35	None
8	6.02	None
9	8.87	$p < .05$
10	5.19	$p < .05$

Validity and Reliability of CPPSC:

A Pearson product-moment correlation of .45 (N=38) was obtained on the CPPSC with the IISD.[1] Both the IISD and the CPPSC were derived to measure self-concept from a similiar theoretical orientation. However, the CPPSC and the IISD involved somewhat different administration techniques and a different kind of involvement on the part of the child. The correlation tends, as a first approximation, to indicate that the CPPSC is measuring the trait it was developed to measure (viz, self-concept) rather than commonality in the methods of assessment. Further studies investigating the convergent and discriminant validity of the CPPSC need to be undertaken to clarify the construct validity of the instrument.

[1]Only IISD protocols with 75% or better intra-subject agreement were used to compute the correlation.

A two day test-retest reliability study of the CPPSC involving 28 six-year-old Day care S's was done during the summer of 1968. A significant Pearson product-moment correlation of .61 was obtained between the two administrations. The short-term stability of the instrument seems to be established.

Relationship of CPPSC to Other Pretest

As can be seen in Table 8, significance was reached in the correlations of CPPSC with the Self-Concept Rating Scale and the Social Skills Scale of the PAR. The low correlation ratio (-.15) obtained between the projective pictures and the anxiety scale was disappointing in view of past research findings reporting a negative relationship between self-concept and anxiety. Judging from the overall correlations obtained between the respective tests, teachers' ratings of self-concept appear to be more related to social perceptions (Social Skills, Language) than to anxiety indicators in the children.

Table 8: Pearson product-moment correlations between pretest instruments on the total Population of Head Start Evaluation Subjects (N=167)

	Self-Concept Rating Scale	Anxiety Scale	Projective Pictures	Social Skills (PAR)	Language Skills (PAR)
Self-Concept Rating Scale		-.15	.20**	.35**	.32**
Anxiety Scale			-.27**	-.27**	-.21**
Projective Pictures				.18*	

* .05 significance
** .01 significance

General Medical and Sociological Information and Its Relationship to Self-Concept Formation in Head Start Children

Introduction

This chapter reviews some of the medical and sociological findings collected on a portion of the initial sample of High and Low Self-Concept children. The major sociological variables examined were: density of family structure and inhabitable living space in a Head Start family, availability of a father in the home, parental punishment of misbehavior, and expectations for success that Head Start parents have for their children. The major medical variables examined were: weight, height, and hemoglobin status. It should be noted that any conclusions reached in this chapter apply only to the sample studied. Extension of the findings to the disadvantaged child in general and the local Head Start population in particular need to be made with circumspection and appropriate specificity. The reasons for these limitations are two fold: (1) the relatively small sample size; (2) the selection of the sample based on a forced dichotomy of High and Low scoring children on the CPPS. Small sample size limits, in many instances, the degree to which generalizations can be made. Also, the way the sample was derived, viz. dichotomization, limits the representativeness of the sample in relationship to the parent population.

Sociological Findings:

Table 9: indicates that High Self-Concept children have fewer mean people per unit rooms of dwelling space than

Low Self-Concept children. The number of people in the dwelling is in essential agreement with the overall Head Start picture. McDavid (1968a) indicated that, nationally, nearly two-thirds of Head Start children come from homes containing six or more people. These figures by themselves mean little. However, the literature on the effects of overcrowding on behavior suggests that severe overcrowding (high number of people per square foot of living area) may have a deleterious effect on the psycho-physiological development of the organism (Appley & Trumbull, 1967.)

Table 9: Comparison of High and Low Self-Concept Children on Density of Living Space

	No. of People in Dwelling	No. of Children in Dwelling	No. of Rooms in Dwelling
High $\bar{x}$ (N=17)	6.70	4.64	4.75
Low $\bar{x}$ (N=26)	7.38	5.38	4.38

Density of family structure was another meaningful area explored. Clausen (1966) reported various studies indicating the negative relationship between family size and academic achievement and/or verbal ability. Hypothesizing a similar relationship between self-concept and family density, family structure data on the 42 High and Low Self-Concept children was quantified into density scores according to an index developed by Waldrop & Bell (1964). The index considered the following variables: (a) total number of children in the

family; (b) time span between the subject and his next younger sibling; (c) time span between the subject and his next older sibling; (d) average time span between births. Projective picture scores were correlated with family density scores by the Spearman Rho method, yielding a nonsignificant relationship, r=-.01. However, when PAR pretest language scores were correlated in the same manner with the density scores, a somewhat higher relationship resulted, r=-.29, which is significant at the .05 level. The latter finding tends to corroborate the reported relationship between verbal ability and family density, while the former finding suggests that no relationship exists between family density and self-concept.

As a method of investigating the sociological variable of parental punishment, the Parental Punitiveness Scale (PPS) was administered to the parents of the High and Low Self-Concept children by four Head Start social workers. Becker (1964) reported a number of studies showing that children given love and reason-oriented control are more prone to acquire desired social codes than those who are physically punished. A logical parallel to this finding is that severity of parental punitiveness should bear a negative relationship to adequacy of self-concept. Unfortunately, a valid estimation of the relationship could not be obtained due to certain shortcomings in the collection of the data. Gross PPS scores, grouped according to social worker, were submitted

to a Kruskall-Wallis H-Test, yielding an H of 9.62, significant at the .05 level. It follows that meaningful comparisons could not be made due to the disparity among social worker scores. The differences among groups may be interpreted in several ways: (1) the nature of the test evokod a degree of defensiveness in a number of parents; (2) parents responded differentially to the social workers' interviewing techniques; (3) social workers' attitudes influenced method of scoring parental punitiveness.

In an attempt to minimize the effects of the social worker variable, individual PPS protocols were analyzed on the basis of percentage of punitiveness directed toward verbal, physical, and indirect aggression. Percentages of punishment scores toward verbal and physical aggression were compared between categories of high and low posttest scores on the projective pictures of self-concept. A Chi-Square analysis fell short of significance at the .05 level. Limited though the findings were, inspection of the data suggested generation of the following hypothesis: the child with high self-concept is punished with greater severity for his verbal aggression than for his physical aggression when compared with the child of low self-concept.

Inspection of the sociological variable, availability of a father in the home, revealed that a high percentage of Head Start children's fathers reside in the domiciles - 76%

for the High Self-Concept children, 81% for the Low Self-Concept children. Nevertheless, it can be seen, as demonstrated in Table 10, that they have little direct involvement in punishing their children for wrongdoing. As Table 10 indicates, the mother punishes the child in a much higher proportion of cases than the father although the father is about equally available for administering the punishment. It should also be noted that the adults (mother, father) account for practically all the punishment that goes on in the household. This finding tends to disagree with an older study of parent-child interaction (Bossard & Boll, 1956). Bossard found that in large families of six or more children, heavy reliance was placed upon older children for maintaining disciplinary control in their younger siblings.

Table 10: Proportion of Head Start Children * Punished by Significant Others in Household

Significant Other	Proportion of Cases Punished By
Mother	28/42
Father	2/42
Brother or Sister	1/42
Mother & Father	9/42
Mother & Sibling	1/42
Other	1/42

* High and Low Self-Concept children combined (N=42)

Certain aspects of parental expectations are presented in Table 11. As can be seen from the ideal and actual parental expectations, the Head Start parents indicated the occupational roles of teacher, nurse, doctor, and lawyer as the most desirable ones for their children. On the other hand, the occupational roles of teacher and nurse were ones which the parent actually felt the child could move into with the greatest frequency. The most dramatic change was in the "Don't Know" category. Most of the parents could ideally conceptualize a future occupational role for their children. However, a high percentage of the parents were unable to place their child in his actual occupational role in the future.

Table 11: Comparison of Ideal and Actual Parental Expectations for Future Occupational Status of their children by Percent of Occurrence.(N=42)

Role	Ideal Expectation	Actual Expectation
Teacher	26.2	21.4
Nurse	21.4	19.0
Doctor	14.2	4.8
Lawyer	9.5	7.1
Professional	2.4	---
Social Worker	2.4	2.4
Business	2.4	---
Entertainer	4.8	7.1
College Graduate	2.4	---
Carpenter	2.4	---
Anything	7.1	2.4
Don't Know	4.8	26.2
Mechanic	---	4.8
Artist	---	2.4
Policeman	---	2.4

Medical Findings:

The relationship between medical information and the self-concept of the child was examined from two points of view. First, differences between High and Low Self-Concept children on the dimensions of height, weight, and hemoglobin status were studied. Second, the scores on the CPPS (combining high and low groups) were examined for their degree of relatedness to height, weight, and hemoglobin status. Table 12 indicates that there was a significant difference between the high and low self-concept groups on the dimensions of height and weight, while this difference did not obtain for hemoglobin status. As can be seen in the table, the fluctuations about the means of the two groups, indicated by the standard deviations, were comparable on the height and weight measures. However, the standard deviations in the hemoglobin status category indicated that the high group had more variability than the low group. Consequently, it appears that in this sample, children who have a better developed physique (in terms of being taller and weighing more) tend to have a higher self-concept score on the CPPSC.

Table 12

Differences in High and Low Self-Concept Children on the Measures of Height, Weight, and Hemoglobin Status

	Height (in.)	Weight (lbs.)	Hemoglobin (gms.%)
Mean	44.59	44.33	11.79
High (N=27)			
S.D.	1.70	5.41	7.16
Mean	43.31	41.21	11.72
Low (N=36)			
S.D.	2.28	5.75	5.21
t	2.2**	2.2**	.01*

* Non-Significant
** .05

Table 13

Means and standard deviations for the combined group of high and low self-concept children for height, weight, and hemoglobin status.

Height (N=62)		Weight (N=62)	Hemoglobin Status (N=61)
Mean	43.85	42.50	11.77
S.D.	2.17	5.85	1.16

Table 13 presents the means and standard deviations for the combined self-concept group on height, weight, and hemoglobin status. A mean height of 43.85 inches and a mean weight of 42.5 pounds would place the average child in the present sample slightly above the mean for children of comparable age in the Iowa charts. The mean score of 11.77 gms.%

of hemoglobin indicates that the average child in the sample is not anemic. However, it should be noted that Garn (1966) has questioned the utility of applying obsolete age-size standards to current groups of children. The rationale for the application of the Iowa City standards to the present group of children needs to be explained more fully by the medical component of the program.

Table 14

Correlation coefficients for CPPSC scores with height, weight, and hemoglobin status

	Height (N=62)	Weight (N=62)	Hemoglobin Status (N=61)
CPPSC	.196	.212	.029

Table 14 indicates that low positive, nonsignificant correlations were obtained for CPPSC scores with height, weight, and hemoglobin status. The results indicate little relationship between the developmental characteristics of height and weight and self-concept. In addition, practically no relationship obtained between CPPSC scores and hemoglobin status.

Conclusion

With any social action - oriented program like Head Start, it is often difficult to determine where the effects of intervention end, and other factors that influence individual or group behavior begin. The present research effort was primarily confined to examining the relationship between attending a particular type of Head Start Program and its effect on the psycho-educational development of the child in it. Taking into consideration certain methodological and instrumentation difficulties, the following conclusions seem warranted in relationship to the original questions posed: 1) Head Start exposure acting in conjunction with maturational processes seem to enhance performance in the areas of: self-concept development, language skills, and social skills. Also, Head Start children performed significantly better in the areas of self-concept, social skills, and language skills than a control group without preschool experience. This indicates that maturation in conjuction with appropriate experience contributes to greater proficiencies in the aforementioned areas than maturation alone does.

The particular way or the degree to which Head Start experience interacted with maturation to provide the gains noted cannot be directly evaluated from this research. What can be said in reference to the present study is that children who have high self-concepts are significantly different from those who have low self-concepts on the dimensions of height

and weight - the high self-concept group weighing more and being taller than the low self-concept group. This might be taken to indicate that certain developmental factors may play a part in positive self-concept genesis in the child. It's possible that taller and heavier children are perceived by their peers and significant others as possessing more environmental mastery than their less tall and lighter classmates. This in turn would center the larger child out for being a prime model, protector, and competitor in a variety of situations. This would give him extra opportunities to gain enviromental satisfaction which would contribute to the growth of self-confidence and selfworth. Following this reasoning, it could be hypothesized that the more physically developed child might be able to profit more from the Head Start experience than the less physically endowed child due to differences in social and environmental perceptions of him. 2) It appears that the program does not have a differential effect on the sexes. The minor differences in changes of self-concept could not be explained by initial sex differences because an analysis indicated no sex difference on the pretest for the boys and girls. Part of the difference in self-concept may be attributed to the difference in the discriminating power of the instrument, i.e. CPPSC seemed to discriminate better for boys than for girls. Further investigation in the area is needed to help clarify the matter. 3) The Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept appears to

hold promise for future investigations probing the area of self-concept in the young disadvantaged child. Initial construct evidence for the CPPSC's reliability, validity, and discriminating power were adequate to justify its use as an exploratory instrument and to give one confidence in its measuring power. Two characteristics of the instrument, as well as the dimension it purports to measure, are its increase as a function of time (age) and its interrelatedness with experience or learning. One would expect self-concept, especially in the young child, to change from age to age in favor of a more positive self-concept at an older age. Such was the finding in the present study. Also, it is often assumed that self-concept characteristics have a motivational influence upon learning. Wylie (1961, p. 201) found evidence of this sort in analyzing experimental learning tasks. A somewhat different type of inference from the present study is that Head Start may help develop positive self-concept development through appropriate experiences.

4) The descriptive sociological data indicated that the Head Start children in the sample came from crowded homes. Whereas, a high percentage of Head Start fathers reside in the homes, they take much less responsibility for punishing the child than the mother does. This may have consequences for Head Start teachers (who are primarily females) and their use of punishment. For example, if the child comes to school with the idea that females (generalized from mother) are strong punishers and he in turn is strongly or continuously

punished, then whatever negative reactions were engendered by mother concerning punishment may be transferred to the preschool situation. This of course could have strong negative consequences for his success in the program.

Whereas, the Head Start parents had relatively high aspirations for occupational success for their children, they felt in many instances that these could not be realized. This finding might be attributed to a lack of information about the child's real ability. More realistically, this finding indicates that parents feel there is little or no possibility for complete freedom of movement out of the ghetto for their child. If the latter is true, then Head Start needs to invest more heavily in social action-oriented programs geared to bring up the actual expectations of the parents into closer alignment with their ideal hopes.

Appendix A

The Children's Projective Pictures of Self-Concept (CPPSC)

When developmental, experiential, and cultural considerations were taken into account, the self-concept measures extent in the research literature were deemed inappropriate for analyzing the particular needs of the Head Start child. It was necessary to develop an instrument which not only incorporated the above considerations, but made cognizance of the correlates of self-concept in behavioral terms. Following the apparently successful approach of Pate & Webb (1966) in their first grade screening test, an initial effort was made to assess the selfperceptions of 60 Head Start children with relevent material from the test. Each child was presented four pictures taken from the Pate & Webb test, in which he was required to pick the child most like himself in scenes depicting children playing, eating, and dressing. Although the data was not subjected to statistical analysis, due to the small number of pictures involved, it was nevertheless observed that a large percentage of the children chose the child in the picture judged to be expressing feelings of inadequacy. It was proposed that an elaborated version of 10 pictures would be of value in assessing self-concept in this age and culture group.

In order to avoid purely intuitive attempts at constructing an additional six pictures, referral was made to the research literature for appropriate content. Studies by Meyerowitz (1962), Piers & Harris (1964), and Wattenberg and Clifford (1964) appeared most pertinent for operationally

defining self-concept as a prelude to identification of behavioral indices. In particular, the Meyerowitz study of self-derogations in first grade educable retardates related to the nature of the task at hand, i.e., the subject's selection of an inadequate child in the scene is tantamount to derogation of self. An analysis was made of the 12 self-derogatory statements Meyerowitz found to be discriminating. Six of the statements were chosen and placed in a behavioral context so that a description could be formulated for creating the proper test stimuli. An example of a Meyerowitz statement was, "Kids like to make this child cry," and its corresponding picture description was: "Two children picking on a third child, who is crying, while a fourth child looks on."

Following formulation of the desired descriptions, a Head Start teacher's aide with artistic ability was contacted to draw the remaining six pictures. Adhering to the research findings referred to earlier, judgements as to degree of adequacy of self-concept were made by the psychological services staff, and consensus was reached as to assessment of points. A copy of the CPPSC scoring sheet may be found following this section.

Administration of Pictures

The pictures used in the present study are black and white productions on 8½ by 11 inch cards. Scenes with children interacting with adults or other children are

depicted on one of two sets of ten cards each, depending upon the sex of the child. In the administration of the pictures, the examiner places the first card before the subject and describes the actions of the children in the picture. He then asks the subject which one of the children is doing what he (the subject) would do. For the remaining cards, the examiner simply points to each of the children in the pictures and asks the subject which one is doing what he would do.

PROJECTIVE PICTURES OF SELF CONCEPT
Dade County Project Head Start
Psychological Services

Name_____ Sex_____ Date_____

School_____ Teacher_____

Examiner_____ Total Score_____

Card	Score	Score	Score	
(1)	0 Figure Falling	0 Figure Hiding	2 Figure Running	
(2)	0 Figure Dependent		2 Figure self-sufficient	
(3)	0 Figure dependent		2 Figure self-sufficient	
(4)	0 Figure bottom fight	1 Fig. with adult	2 Fig. top fight	3 Figure sliding
(5)	0 Figure alone	1 Figure right	1 Figure left	2 Figure center
(6)	0 Figure scolded		2 Figure among group	
(7)	0 Figure tears	1 Figure taunting	2 Figure observing	
(8)	0 Figure alone	1 Boy back	1 Girl back	2 Front figure
(9)	0 Figure alone	1 Middle group	2 Line leader	
(10)	0 Figure alone	2 Boy back	2 Girl back	

Preschool Attainment Record (PAR)

The PAR (Doll, 1966) attempts to evaluate specific attainments of the child from birth to seven years of age in half year increments. This instrument has eight categories of development behavior. For each category there is one item for each age period. Thus, there are 14 items for each category. As the manual notes: The PAR, "follows the general design established by the Vineland Social Maturity Scale. It calls for a system of standardized interview reporting with an informant who is familiar with the child's usual behavior." The examiner attempts to obtain accurate descriptions of the child's behavior from the interviewer. Items are scored according to the degree to which the child's performance satisfies the item definition. A major shortcoming of the scale is its lack of complete standardization. The three categories, taken from the PAR, along with their defining items are presented on the following page.

PRESCHOOL ATTAINMENT RECORD

RAPPORT

Regards; responds ____
Attends; briefly ____
Initiates actions ____
Discriminates; chooses ____
Complies; cooperates ____
Plays beside ____
Plays with ____
Plays cooperatively ____
Attends; concentrates ____
Sings harmoniously ____
Helps simple tasks ____
Plays pretend ____
Plays competitively ____
Plays rule games ____

COMMUNICATION

Babbles inarticulately ____
Vocalizes non-verbally ____
Imitates; echoes ____
Invites responses ____
Speaks familiar words ____
Talks in phrases ____
Converses in sentences ____
Relates in paragraphs ____
Describes and shares ____
Recites; reproduces ____
Prints first name ____
Copies familiar words ____
Reads short sentences ____
Adds to 10 ____

RESPONSIBILITY

Nurses, breast or bottle ____
Chews semi-solids ____
Rests; voluntary relaxation ____
Minds; obeys ____
Conserves materials ____
Takes Care ____
Gets drink ____
Dresser self ____
Toilets self ____
Cleans up ____
Respects property ____
Conforms to customs ____
Cooperates with others ____
Observes routines ____

Self-Concept Rating Scale

The Self-Concept Rating Scale utilized in the present study is one of four subscales developed by Butler and her associates in the Evaluation Scale for Four and Five-Year-Old Children (1965). The scale has a five point continuum, in which 2 and 4 represent numerical values for behavioral descriptions in left and right columns respectivly. The teacher is required to assess the child in relation to the two columns, assigning 1 to 5 points for the test items. The scale defines self-concept in behavioral terms under the headings of: awareness of self, feelings about self, progress toward self-sufficiency, involvment in task, openness to new experiences, and ability to relate to others. A copy of the Self-Concept Rating Scale with instructions may be found following this section.

INSTRUCTION SHEET

In rating the child's behavior, numerical values should be assigned as follows:

The child consistently performs at a lower level of behavior than is described in the left column. 1

The child usually behaves in accordance with the description in the left column. He may occasionally show more or less advanced behavior, but this is a good description of his usual behavior. 2

The child's behavior cannot easily be classified in either the left or the right column. His behavior fluctuates from one level to the other; he falls somewhere on a continuum between the two descriptions. 3

The child usually behaves in accordance with the description on the right column. He may not quite measure up to one aspect of the described behavior; he may always measure up to other aspects of the description. 4

The child's performance always reaches or exceeds the behavior described in the right hand column. 5

Name_____ Sex: M F Age:_____

School_____ Teacher_____

A. 1 2 3 4 5

Is self-conscious and shy: very easily embarrassed.

Free from inappropriate self-consciousness. Appears self composed.

B. 1 2 3 4 5

Unsure whether he is liked: dominates, defends, blames, rejects. Tends to respond negatively to the approaches of others

Sees himself as liked; approaches children with positive suggestions and ideas of things to do. Responds positively to the suggestions of others.

C. 1 2 3 4 5

Needs constant directions or support from the teacher, or shows much dependence on another child.

Needs only a minimum of direction by the teacher to become involved in productive activity. Abides by his own idea of what he wants to do in his relationships with children.

D. 1 2 3 4 5

Flits from one activity to another; samples but does not become deeply involved.

Plans and persists in activity for the sake of the activity.

E. 1 2 3 4 5

Returns repeatedly to one or two activities which are satisfying. Is reluctant to enter new situations. May act negative or resistant.

Is open to a variety of activities. Gains satisfaction from using many materials available to his class. Is challenged by new and difficult tasks.

F. 1 2 3 4 5

Lacks techniques for joining a group; bangs on fringes.

Easily joins or leaves a group if he so desires.

The Anxiety Scale

Since several studies (Barber, 1952; Lipsitt, 1958; Piers & Harris, 1964) have reported a negative relationship between self-concept and children's anxiety, efforts were made to measure anxiety in the present subject population. In addition to contributing to validation of the self-concept procedures, measurement of anxiety and anxiety reduction over time was observed as a worthwhile goal in assessment of Head Start effectiveness. The Anxiety Scale used in the present study was developed by Mendel (1964) in her study of preferences for novelty in nursery school children. The scale consists of 24 items which were originally used by Sarason et al. (1960). The items, which include behavioral indices of both overt and covert anxiety, are on a six point scale, with left and right polar descriptions representative of behavior extremes. Each item is scored according to low, medium, and high anxiety (1, 2, 3 points respectively) at appropriate places along the six point continuum. The positioning of graded anxiety scores may or may not coincide with the 3-2-1-1-2-3 order presented on all items to the teacher rater. Total score is such that the higher the score, the higher the anxiety, and therefore the higher the relationship with maladjustment. The weighted scale with instructions appears following this section.

INSTRUCTIONS

Here is a list of statements used to describe people. As you can see, they are paired off into opposites. I would like you to decide where each child is in terms of each lair of statements. Between each two statements are the numbers

3 2 1 1 2 3.

Decide which of the two statements describes the child better, and circle one of the three next to that word as follows:

1. a little more on this side
2. definitely on this side
3. very much on this side

compared with children of his age.

Example:

Tall 3 2 1 1 2 3 Short

If the child is very tall, you would circle the 3 right next to the word "Tall". If he were a little on the short side, you would circle the 1 closest to the word "Short", and so on, circling one number for each child on each sheet of this scale.

Since an independent judgment is needed from each teacher, please do not discuss your impression of the children before you have done the rating.

Please complete each rating for all the children on that page before going on to the next statement on the following page.

Name_____ School_____ Age_____

1. Plays actively	2	1	1	2	3	3	Plays inactively
2. Talkative	3	2	1	1	2	3	Talks little
3. Has trouble making up his mind	3	3	2	1	1	2	Makes quick decisions
4. Worries often about things at home	3	3	2	1	1	2	Rarely worries about things at home
5. Gets in fights and arguments often and easily	3	2	1	1	2	3	Avoids fights and arguments
6. Enjoys playing alone most	3	3	2	2	1	1	Enjoys playing with other children most
7. Unconcerned about mussing up clothes	1	1	2	2	3	3	Afraid to get clothes mussed up
8. Almost never cries	1	1	2	2	3	3	Cries often
9. Likes to follow others, imitates	3	2	1	1	2	3	Likes to "run the show," is imitated
10. Assertive, stands up for his rights	2	1	1	2	3	3	Does not assert himself
11. Hides feelings	3	3	2	1	1	2	Shows feelings
12. Neat and orderly	3	2	1	1	2	3	Not neat and orderly
13. Almost never gets angry	3	3	2	1	1	2	Gets angry often and easily
14. Seeks a lot of contact with teachers	3	2	2	1	1	2	Seeks very little contact with teachers
15. Is fidgety, squirming, restless	3	2	1	1	2	3	Is very calm and quiet
16. Worries	3	3	2	2	1	1	Does not worry
17. Goes to the toilet more often than most children his age	3	3	1	1	2	2	Goes to the toilet more rarely than most children his age

18. Behaves affectionately and enjoys affection from others	1	1	2	2	3	3	Does not show affection and does not enjoy affection from others
19. Impulsive	3	2	1	1	2	3	Plans carefully
20. Has many fears	3	3	2	2	1	1	Has no fears
21. Often takes blame, admits error	3	2	1	1	2	3	Blames others, does not admit error
22. Feels superior to other children	3	3	1	1	2	2	Feels inferior to other children
23. Is concerned about always being "good," anxious to please	3	3	1	1	2	2	Is a "naughty" child, provokes irritation
24. Expects the best most of the time	1	1	2	2	3	3	Expects the worst most of the time

Appendix B

The Illinois Index of Self-Derogation (Modified Form)

The Illinois Index of Self-Derogation, described by Meyerowiz (1962) in his study of self-derogations in young retardates, was modified for the present study in order to facilitate comprehension and to conform to specific research goals. In lieu of the 30 items of the original study, the present version contains 20 items, each containing two statements comparing stick figures in socially desirable and socially undesirable terms. Sixteen of the items are scorable derogations and four are reliability check items.

In the administration of the test, the examiner first shows the child an 8½ by 11 inch card depicting two stick figures, identical except one is holding a flag and the other a balloon. The examiner then determines whether the child is able to identify the stick figures as "Flag Boy (Girl)" and the "Balloon Boy (Girl)". After the preliminary demonstration the examiner reads the 20 pairs of statements to the child, who is required to select the description most like himself. He makes his choice by pointing to the desired stick figure on a score sheet containing 5 pairs of stick figures. The modified form of the Self-Derogation Index with directions may be found following this section.

Directions

"We're going to play a game about a flag boy (girl) and a balloon boy (girl)". Examiner shows large card with picture of stick figure with flag and stick figure with balloon.

Here are two boys (2 girls). One is holding a flag. One is holding a balloon. His name (points) is flag boy. His name is balloon boy (points). Show me flag boy. Show me balloon boy. Good, now let's play the game using the pictures on this paper.

EXAMINER PRESENTS PAPER WITH FIVE (5) PAIRS OF STICK FIGURES.

LIST OF STATEMENTS

After each pair of statements, examiner says, "Which child is most like you? Substitute "girl" and appropriate pronouns for female subject. After child makes his choice, examiner says, "Then let's circle the (balloon boy, flag boy)". The examiner draws a circle around the choice.

1. The balloon boy likes to run and play.

   The flag boy likes to sit by himself.

2. The flag boy is a fast runner.

   The balloon boy cannot run fast.

3. The balloon boy's mother does not love him.

   The flag boy's mother likes him a lot.

4. Kids like to make the flag boy cry.

   The balloon boy never cries.

5. The flag boy does not like to pick on kids.

   The balloon boy likes to pick on kids.

6. The balloon boy's mother likes him better than his brother.

   The flag boy's mother likes his brother better than him.

7. The balloon boy knows nothing in school.

   The flag boy knows many things in school.

8. The flag boy has no friends.

   The balloon boy has many friends.

9. The balloon boy is a fast runner.

   *The flag boy cannot run fast.

10. The flag boy is the same as other children.

    The balloon boy is not the same as other children.

11. The flag boy likes to go with his mother everywhere.

    The balloon boy likes to go with his friends everywhere.

12. The flag boy does not like school.

    The balloon boy likes school.

13. The flag boy never cries.

    *Kids like to make the balloon boy cry.

14. The balloon boy's mother dresses him every morning.

    The flag boy dresses himself every morning.

15. The flag boy knows nothing in school.

    *The balloon boy knows many things in school.

16. The flag boy's mother feeds him when he eats.

    The balloon boy eats without help.

---

*Reliability check items.

17. Kids like the balloon boy.

    Kids do not like the flag boy.

18. The flag boy is not afraid of anything.

    The balloon boys is afraid of lots of things.

19. The flag boy is the last one in line.

    The balloon boy is the first one in line.

20. The balloon boy has no friends.

    *The flag boy has many friends.

---

*Reliability check items.

Appendix C

Parental Punitiveness Scale (Modified Form)

The Parental Punitiveness Scale, developed by Epstein and Komorita (1965), is structured principally to measure children's perceptions of parental discipline toward aggression. The present modification of the scale utilizes 30 of the original 45 items, and is administered to the parent instead of to the child. The original scale was constructed to measure parental punitiveness toward physical, verbal, and indirect aggression in each of five major situations: aggression toward parents, teachers, siblings, peers, and inanimate objects. The task of the subject in response to the descriptive statements is to choose one of four forms of punishment. The response alternatives, ranked according to degree of severity, were originally given arbitrary integral weights of 1, 2, 3, and 4. However, since the parent protocols in the present study contained many items with more than one alternative chosen, the weights were revised as follows: (a) have a long talk with him (her) - one point; (b) take away his (her) television - two points; (c) combination of two alternatives - three points; (d) send him (her) to bed without supper - four points; (e) whip him (her) - five points. The modified form of the Parental Punitiveness Scale with post-administration score sheet may be seen following this section.

PARENTAL PUNITIVENESS SCALE

1. If he (she) puts paint on someone's house.
2. If he (she) throws a rock at someone's car.
3. If he (she) throws something at his (her) brother (or sister).
4. If he (she) steals something that belongs to a teacher.
5. If he (she) breaks something that belongs to another child.
6. If he (she) kicks another child.
7. If he (she) kicks his (her) brother (or sister).
8. If he (she) breaks a window.
9. If he (she) screams at a teacher.
10. If he (she) puts ink on someone's clothing.
11. If he (she) hits a teacher.
12. If he (she) steals something that belongs to his (her) brother (or sister).
13. If he (she) lies to a teacher.
14. If he (she) breaks something that belongs to his (her) brother (or sister).
15. If he (she) swears at his (her) brother (or sister).
16. If he (she) puts sand in someone's car.
17. If he (she) starts a fire in someone's yard.
18. If he (she) swears at you or your husband (wife).
19. If he (she) steals something that belongs to another child.
20. If he (she) throws something at you or your husband (wife).
21. If he (she) hits another child.
22. If he (she) swears at a teacher.
23. If he (she) steals something that belonged to you or your husband (wife).
24. If he (she) throws something at a teacher.
25. If he (she) breaks something that belongs to a teacher.
26. If he (she) throws something at another child.
27. If he (she) lies to you or your husband (wife).
28. If he (she) hits you or your husband (wife).
29. If he (she) talks back to a teacher.
30. If he (she) talks back to you or your husband (wife).

PARENTAL PUNITIVENESS SCORING SHEET

PHYSICAL				VERBAL				INDIRECT				
								1.				
								2.				
		3.										
										4.		
												5.
			6.									
		7.										
								8.				
					9.							
			10.									
	11.											
											12.	
					13.							
											14.	
						15.						
								16.				
								17.				
				18.								
												19.
20.												
			21.									
					22.							
									23.			
	24.											
										25.		
			26.									
				27.								
28.												
					29.							
				30.								
PARENT	TEACHER	SIB	PEER	PARENT	TEACHER	SIB		ADULT	PARENT	TEACHER	SIB	PEER

Total Physical_____ Total Verbal_____ Total Indirect_____

THREE CATEGORY TOTALS: PARENT_____TEACHER_____SIB_____PEER_____

SOCIAL HISTROY INFORMATION FORM

Name of Child: _____ School _____

1. Informant _____ Relationship_____

2. Type of Dwelling: Apartment _____
   Single family _____
   Multi-family _____

   Number of rooms _____

   Size of dwelling: Small _____ Average _____ Large _____

3. Number of children living in home _____ Ages: _____

4. Number of adults living in home _____

   Relationship: _____

5. Child Care:

   a. Who usually prepares child's meals? _____
   b. Who usually helps dress the child? _____
   c. Who usually spends the most time playing inside the house with the child? Adult _____ Other Child _____
   d. Who usually punishes the child? _____

6. How smart would you say _____ is?
   (child's name)

   Above Average_____ Average_____ Below Average_____

7. How does _____ get along with other children?
   (child's name)

   Above Average_____ Average_____ Below Average_____

8. How much does _____ talk?
   (child's name)

   Above Average_____ Average_____ Below Average_____

9. Parent Expectations:

   a. What would you like _____ to be when he grows up?
      (child's name)
      _____

   b. What do you think he will actually be when he grows up? _____

REFERENCES

Appley, M. H. & Trumbull, R. (Eds.) Psychological Stress. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1967.

Barber, L. Immature ego development as a factor in retarded ability to read. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1952.

Becker, W. C. Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In Hoffman, M. L. & Hoffman, L. W. (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research, Volume I. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964; Pp. 169-208.

Bereiter, C. Instructional planning in early compensatory education. In J. Hellmuth (Eds.) The Disadvantaged Child, vol. I Seattle: Special Child Publication, 1967.

Bereiter, C., & Englemann, S. Teaching Disadvantaged Children In The Preschool. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Bossard, J. J. S., & Boll, E. S. The Large Family System. Philadelphia: Univ. Pennsylvania Press, 1956.

Butler, A. L. Evaluation of the self-concept. From An Evaluation Scale for Four and Five Year Old Children. Bulletin of the School of Education, Indiana University. March, 1965.

Clausen, J. A. Family structure, socialization, and personality. In Hoffman, L. W. & Hoffman, M. L. (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research, Volume 2. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966; Pp. 1-53.

Doll, E. A. PAR Preschool Attainment Record. Circle Pines, Minnesota: American Guidance Service, Inc., 1966.

Epstein, R., & Komorita, S. S. The development of a scale of parental punitiveness toward aggression. Child Development, 1965; 36, 129-142.

Garn, S. M. Body size and its implications. In Hoffman, L. W. & Hoffman, M. L. (Eds.) Review of Child Development Research, Volume 2. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1966; Pp. 529-561.

Head Start child development, A manual of policies and instruction Community Action Program, Office of Economic Opportunity. Washington, D. C., 1967.

Karnes, M. B. A research program to determine the effects of various pre-school intervention programs on the development of disadvantaged children and the strategic age for such intervention. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 10, 1968.

Karnes, M. B., Hodgins, M. A., & Teska, J. A. An evaluation of two pre-school programs for disadvantaged children: A traditional and a highly structured experimental preschool. Exceptional Children. May, 1968; Pp. 667-676.

Lipsitt, L. P. A self-concept scale for children and its relationship to the children's form of the Manifest Anxiety Scale. Child Development, 1958, 29, 463-472.

McDavid, J. W. Factors affecting cognitive growth in project Head Start. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, February 18, 1968. (a)

Mendel, Gisela. Children's preferences for differing degrees of novelty. Child Development, 1964, 36, 453-465.

Meyerowitz, J. H. Self derogations in young retardates and special placement. Child Development, 1962, 33, 443-351.

Pate, J. E., S. Webb. W.W. First Grade Screening Test. Circle Pines, Minnesota; American Guidance Service, Inc. 1966.

Piers, E. V., & Harris, D. B. Age and other correlates of self-concept in children. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1964, 55, 91-95.

Sarason, S. B., Davidson, K. S., Lighthall, F. F., White, R. R., S. Ruebush, B. K. Anxiety in Elementary School Children. New York, Wiley, 1960.

Waldrop, M. F., & Bell, R. Q. Relation of preschool dependency behavior to family size and density. Child Development, 1964, 35, 1187-1195.

Wattenberg, W. W., & Clifford, Clare. Relation of self-concepts to beginning achievement in reading. Child Development, 1964, 35, 461-467.

Wylie, R. The Self-Concept. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.